



LAWRENCE
LIVERMORE
NATIONAL
LABORATORY

Efficient Wide-Range Calculation of Free Energies in Solids and Liquids using Reversible Scaling Molecular Dynamics

John A. Moriarty and Justin B. Haskins

February 27, 2014

Submitted for publication in Physical Review B

Disclaimer

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States government. Neither the United States government nor Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, nor any of their employees makes any warranty, expressed or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

Efficient Wide-Range Calculation of Free Energies in Solids and Liquids using Reversible Scaling Molecular Dynamics

John A. Moriarty¹ and Justin B. Haskins²

¹Condensed Matter and Materials Division, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory,
Livermore, California 94551-0808 USA

²NASA-Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California 94035 USA

Abstract

We elaborate an efficient computational method to calculate multiphase Helmholtz free energies over wide ranges of volume and temperature in materials that can be described by temperature-independent ion forces. Our method leverages and extends the technique of reversible scaling molecular dynamics (RSMD) proposed by de Konig *et al.* [Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3973 (1999)], which allows a free-energy difference in a given phase at constant volume to be calculated as a function of temperature from a single MD simulation. In mechanically stable solid phases, our approach combines standard quasiharmonic lattice dynamics at low temperatures with RSMD simulation of the anharmonic vibrational free energy at high temperatures to produce a seamless free energy from zero temperature to above melt along constant-volume isochores. In the liquid, we combine an accurate calculation of the free energy along a high-temperature reference isotherm with isochoric RSMD simulations from that temperature to below melt. In metastable solid phases that are mechanically unstable at low temperature, we use two-phase MD melt simulations together with the liquid free energy to calculate the solid free energy along the solidus melt line and then perform isochoric RSMD simulations to temperatures above and below that point. We have specifically adapted our free-energy methodology to metals where the ion forces are well described by model generalized pseudopotential theory (MGPT) multi-ion interatomic potentials. Then using refined Ta6.8x MGPT potentials, we have converged total free energies and their components to sub-mRy numerical accuracy in the stable-bcc, liquid, and metastable-fcc phases of tantalum for volumes ranging from up to 26% expansion to nearly two-fold

compression and for temperatures to 25,000 K. In turn, we have successfully used the free energies to calculate physically accurate thermodynamic properties, including bcc and fcc melt curves and a multiphase equation of state for Ta over the same temperature range and for pressures as high as 600 GPa.

PACS: 05.70.Ce, 02.70.Ns, 34.20.Cf, 64.30.Ef

I. INTRODUCTION

The efficient calculation of accurate free energies in solids and liquids from molecular dynamics (MD) simulations is a challenging problem of long-standing interest and importance. Numerous specific computational schemes have been developed that depend to varying degrees on the principles of thermodynamic integration (TI) [1,2], adiabatic switching (AS) [2,3], and/or thermodynamic perturbation theory (TPT) [2,4,5]. Particularly challenging is the problem of efficiently calculating free energies in real materials over wide ranges of volume or pressure and temperature in multiple phases. This capability is required to obtain multiphase equations of state and equilibrium phase lines to high (1-2%) accuracy from a given set of either quantum-mechanical or empirical interatomic forces. The simplifying and highly efficient method of reversible scaling molecular dynamics (RSMD) proposed by de Konig *et al.* [3], which marries the principles of TI and AS, has proven to be useful in this regard to obtain free-energy differences as a function of temperature at constant volume in a given phase from a single MD simulation. In mechanically stable solid phases, we have been able to combine RSMD simulation at high temperature with quasiharmonic lattice dynamics (QHLD) at low temperature to obtain absolute free energies from zero temperature to above melt. In the liquid phase, we similarly have combined RSMD simulation with an accurate method to obtain absolute reference free energies at high temperature, an approach developed by marrying the principles of AS and TPT. Using quantum-mechanical interatomic potentials obtained from model generalized pseudopotential theory (MGPT) [6-11], our free-energy approach has been successfully applied to calculate accurate high-pressure melting curves in metals [10,11] in a fraction of the time previously required from thermodynamic integration alone [7,8]. We have also now extended our method to treat unstable solid phases that are only mechanically stabilized at high temperature by large anharmonic vibrational effects, where such structures become either metastable or stable phases in the high-temperature phase diagram. The purpose of this paper is to elaborate the details of our RSMD-based free-energy approach, and to illustrate the power and utility of the method through application to the temperature-pressure phase diagram and multiphase equation of state of tantalum (Ta).

To state more specifically the technical problem addressed in this paper, we seek to calculate the total Helmholtz free energy *per atom* $A(\Omega, T)$ for a given solid or liquid phase of a material over extended ranges of atomic volume Ω and temperature T in terms of the material's total internal energy,

$$E(\Omega, T) = -T^2 \left. \frac{\partial(A/T)}{\partial T} \right|_{\Omega}, \quad (1)$$

and total internal pressure,

$$P(\Omega, T) = - \left(\left. \frac{\partial A}{\partial \Omega} \right) \right|_T, \quad (2)$$

quantities that can be obtained directly from MD simulation at high temperature, and in the case of a mechanically stable solid phase from QHLD at low temperature. Formal thermodynamic integration of Eq. (1) from a reference temperature T_{ref} and Eq. (2) from a reference volume Ω_{ref} gives, respectively,

$$A(\Omega, T) = (T / T_{\text{ref}}) A(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}}) - T \int_{T_{\text{ref}}}^T [E(\Omega, T') / (T')^2] dT' \quad (3)$$

and

$$A(\Omega, T) = A(\Omega_{\text{ref}}, T) - \int_{\Omega_{\text{ref}}}^{\Omega} P(\Omega', T) d\Omega'. \quad (4)$$

Evaluating Eq. (4) at $T = T_{\text{ref}}$ and inserting the result into Eq. (3) then yields

$$A(\Omega, T) = (T / T_{\text{ref}}) [A(\Omega_{\text{ref}}, T_{\text{ref}}) - \int_{\Omega_{\text{ref}}}^{\Omega} P(\Omega', T_{\text{ref}}) d\Omega'] - T \int_{T_{\text{ref}}}^T [E(\Omega, T') / (T')^2] dT'. \quad (5)$$

Equation (5) is often the starting point for a direct TI calculation of $A(\Omega, T)$ from MD data on $E(\Omega, T)$ and $P(\Omega, T)$. This starting point has the advantage of requiring a

reference free energy $A(\Omega_{\text{ref}}, T_{\text{ref}})$ at only a single volume and temperature for a given phase. However, there are also unwanted computational inefficiencies in the integral terms in Eq. (5). Because pressure is inherently a derivative quantity, it is usually true that for a given level of computing effort, MD energies are obtained more accurately than pressures. For this reason, we prefer not to integrate the pressure to obtain a free-energy contribution, but instead to calculate the pressure after the fact from Eq. (2). This makes Eq. (3), which does not require knowledge of the pressure, a more attractive starting point than Eq. (5), although the former does require a reference free energy across an entire $T = T_{\text{ref}}$ isotherm, or at least over some parametric curve $T_{\text{ref}}(\Omega)$ that crosses the entire volume range of interest. Equations (3) and (5), however, still require a detailed knowledge of the total internal energy $E(\Omega, T)$ over the entire volume and temperature ranges of interest. In practice, this could easily require 50-100 long MD simulations to obtain $E(\Omega, T)$ accurately for a single wide-range phase. The simplification that RSMD provides is to replace the energy integral over temperature in Eqs. (3) and (5) with an equivalent time integral that can be evaluated in a single MD simulation.

Our present RSMD-based methodology to evaluate the free energy $A(\Omega, T)$ starting from Eq. (3) is developed in Sec. II for the familiar case of weak-coupling materials, whose thermodynamic functions can be partitioned into zero-temperature, ion-thermal, and electron-thermal components, with assumed temperature-independent forces on the ions and small electron-thermal contributions. We derive a general RSMD equation for the important ion-thermal free energy in Sec. IIA, and then implement that result for the three material phases of most direct interest. First, in Sec. IIB we treat the stable solid phase, using a $T_{\text{ref}} = 0$ reference isotherm, and including an accurate, isolated evaluation of the anharmonic vibrational contribution to the free energy, which can be directly added to the quasiharmonic contribution. Then in Sec. IIC we address the liquid phase, using a high-temperature reference isotherm, and introducing an independent AS-TPT method to calculate the reference free energy along that isotherm. Finally, in Sec. IID we consider the metastable solid phase, using a reference high-temperature melt curve $T_{\text{m}}(\Omega)$, which can be independently calculated by accurate two-phase MD coexistence simulations [11].

In Sec. IIE we also discuss an efficient way to add the small additional electron-thermal free energy component for the case of metals.

While our developed free-energy methodology is general, and can be applied to metals and non-metals alike, for definiteness and for the intended application to Ta in Sec. III, we have here specifically adapted the present methodology to the case of metals described by multi-ion MGPT interatomic potentials [6-11]. We have also taken this opportunity to elaborate additional important details in Sec. IIIA about our refined Ta6.8x MGPT potentials, which were first applied in Ref. [11]. In the remainder of Sec. III, these potentials are used to calculate the free energy and its components of the stable bcc solid phase, the high-temperature liquid phase, and the metastable fcc phase of Ta. In the process, we test the computational accuracy and efficiency of our free-energy method, as well as the physical accuracy of the Ta6.8x potentials in describing both sensitive thermodynamic derivatives at ambient pressure and the equation of state and melt behavior of Ta at high pressure. Our conclusions are given in Sec. IV.

II. THEORETICAL AND COMPUTATIONAL APPROACH

We assume that the thermodynamics of the system of interest is well described by the conventional weak-coupling model, in which the total Helmholtz free energy can be expressed as a sum of cold ($T = 0$), ion-thermal, and electron-thermal contributions:

$$A(\Omega, T) = E_0(\Omega) + A_{\text{ion}}(\Omega, T) + A_{\text{el}}(\Omega, T) , \quad (6)$$

with corresponding equations for the total internal energy and pressure:

$$E(\Omega, T) = E_0(\Omega) + E_{\text{ion}}(\Omega, T) + E_{\text{el}}(\Omega, T) \quad (7)$$

$$P(\Omega, T) = P_0(\Omega) + P_{\text{ion}}(\Omega, T) + P_{\text{el}}(\Omega, T) . \quad (8)$$

In Eq. (6) we have noted that one can take $A_0 = E_0$ and remain consistent with Eq. (3) without any loss in generality. It further follows that the ion-thermal and electron-thermal free-energy components, A_{ion} and A_{el} in Eq. (6), satisfy Eq. (3) separately:

$$A_{\text{ion}}(\Omega, T) = (T / T_{\text{ref}}) A_{\text{ion}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}}) - T \int_{T_{\text{ref}}}^T [E_{\text{ion}}(\Omega, T') / (T')^2] dT' \quad (9)$$

$$A_{\text{el}}(\Omega, T) = (T / T_{\text{ref}}) A_{\text{el}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}}) - T \int_{T_{\text{ref}}}^T [E_{\text{el}}(\Omega, T') / (T')^2] dT' . \quad (10)$$

Consistent with the requirements of RSMD simulation [3], Eqs. (6)-(10) also implicitly assume that the forces that control ion motion in the system are independent of temperature. In compatible quantum-mechanical treatments, such forces would normally be obtained at zero electron temperature, as, for example, with first-principles generalized pseudopotential theory (GPT) [12-16] pair potentials, or *model* GPT (MGPT) [6-11] multi-ion potentials, or with tight-binding approaches such as Pettifor's bond-order potentials (BOP) [17-19]. In such a case, the final electron-thermal free-energy component A_{el} in Eq. (6) embodies the remaining effects of electron temperature T_{el} on the structure and occupation of the electronic states of the system. Quantum-mechanical

treatments that explicitly incorporate electron temperature and produce T_{el} -dependent forces, however, such as quantum molecular dynamics (QMD) simulations in metals based on finite-temperature density-functional theory (DFT) [5,20], or the new T_{el} -dependent MGPT potentials for transition metals [20], are currently beyond the scope of RSMD and are not directly considered here. At the other extreme, temperature-independent empirical potentials such as embedded-atom method (EAM) [21] or Finnis-Sinclair (FS) [22] potentials are compatible with RSMD and the present free-energy approach. The present approach has been specifically adapted to multi-ion MGPT potentials, but can be readily extended to GPT, BOP, EAM, FS or any other temperature-independent potentials.

Two further practical considerations concerning the application of Eqs. (6)-(10) should also be mentioned. First, the cold energy and pressure components, E_0 and P_0 , in Eqs. (6)-(8) can be treated in two closely related but distinct ways. The first option is to assign E_0 and P_0 to the $T = 0$ ground state phase of the material and absorb the structural-energy differences with other phases into $A_{\text{ion}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})$ in Eq. (9). This option is especially convenient when treating the liquid in combination with the ground-state or other stable solid phase to obtain an equilibrium melt curve, and is the treatment of choice for this case. Alternatively, one can calculate a separate E_0 and P_0 for each phase considered. This option is most useful when one is treating multiple solid phases, including metastable phases.

The second practical consideration here concerns the treatment of the electron-thermal free-energy component A_{el} in Eq. (6). In systems where the underlying weak-coupling thermodynamic model works well, A_{el} is a small correction to A_{ion} , and this is implicitly assumed in the development below. If desired, A_{el} can be neglected entirely, as is usually done for semiconductors or insulators, or is often done for metals as well when the required electron-thermal information is not available. Alternatively, however, A_{el} can be treated in a separate approximate manner, as discussed below in Sec. IIE for the case of metals. But for metals and non-metals alike, the central focus of attention in the

present approach is the calculation of the ion-thermal free-energy component A_{ion} , to which the RSMD method is specifically addressed.

A. Reversible scaling molecular dynamics for A_{ion}

The RSMD method of de Koning *et al.* [3] takes direct advantage of the fact that in the classical statistical mechanics of an MD simulation for an N -ion system, the free energy depends on the total potential-energy function $U(\mathbf{R}) \equiv U(\mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{R}_2, \dots, \mathbf{R}_N)$ establishing the interatomic forces on the ions only through the Boltzmann factor $\exp(-U/k_B T)$, where k_B is the Boltzmann constant. If one runs an MD simulation at a fixed simulation temperature T_{ref} for a scaled potential-energy function λU , then the corresponding free energy of the unscaled system is thereby determined for a temperature $T = T_{\text{ref}} / \lambda$. In an RSMD simulation, the scaling factor λ is allowed to vary slowly and linearly with time,

$$\lambda(t) = 1 + \frac{\lambda_f - 1}{t_s} t, \quad (11)$$

starting from an initial value of $\lambda = 1$, corresponding to the initial temperature T_{ref} , to a final value of $\lambda_f = \lambda(t_s) = T_{\text{ref}} / T_f$, where T_f is the final apparent temperature for which the free energy is to be obtained. If the switching time t_s between those limits is long, then the RSMD simulation process is adiabatic and the temperature integral in Eq. (9) can be evaluated in terms of an equivalent time integral W_{ion} [3] as follows:

$$-T \int_{T_{\text{ref}}}^T [E_{\text{ion}}(\Omega, T') / (T')^2] dT' = \frac{W_{\text{ion}}}{\lambda} + \frac{3}{2} k_B T \ln \lambda - \left(1 - \frac{1}{\lambda}\right) E_0, \quad (12)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\text{ion}}(\Omega, T(t)) &= \frac{1}{N} \int_0^t \frac{d\lambda(t')}{dt'} U(\mathbf{R}(t')) dt' \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \frac{\lambda_f - 1}{N_s} \sum_{n=1}^{n_s(t)} U(\mathbf{R}(t_n)) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

In the second line of Eq. (13), the time integral has been evaluated using the histogram method, assuming a small simulation time step h and N_s time steps, such that $t_s = N_s h$. In practice we take h on the order of 0.2 fs and N_s in the range $10^5 - 10^7$, depending on the problem addressed and the numerical accuracy required, so t_s is in the range of 20–2000 ps. Finally, inserting Eq. (12) back into Eq. (9) and using $\lambda^{-1} = T / T_{\text{ref}}$ one has the general result

$$A_{\text{ion}}(\Omega, T) = \frac{T}{T_{\text{ref}}} [E_0(\Omega) + A_{\text{ion}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}}) + W_{\text{ion}}(\Omega, T)] - \frac{3}{2} k_B T \ln \frac{T}{T_{\text{ref}}} - E_0(\Omega) . \quad (14)$$

The use of this result in the special cases of the stable solid, the liquid, and the metastable solid is discussed below in Secs. IIB, IIC, and IID, respectively.

B. Ion-thermal free energy $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{sol}}$ of the stable solid

The ion-thermal free energy for a stable solid phase can be conveniently divided into quasiharmonic and anharmonic contributions:

$$A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{sol}}(\Omega, T) = A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{qh}}(\Omega, T) + A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{ah}}(\Omega, T) . \quad (15)$$

The former contribution can be expressed directly in terms of the volume-dependent quasiharmonic phonon frequencies $\nu_\lambda(\mathbf{q}, \Omega)$ of the solid crystal structure in question by the well-known result

$$A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{qh}}(\Omega, T) = \frac{k_B T}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{q}, \lambda} \ln \{ 2 \sinh [h \nu_\lambda(\mathbf{q}, \Omega) / (2 k_B T)] \} , \quad (16)$$

where the sum is over all wave vectors \mathbf{q} and phonon branches λ in the first Brillouin zone (BZ) of the reciprocal lattice. Equation (16) fully takes into account the quantum Bose-Einstein statistics required in the low-temperature solid and is consistent with a $T_{\text{ref}} = 0$ reference temperature, such that $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{qh}}(\Omega, 0) = E_{\text{ph}}^0(\Omega)$, where

$$E_{ph}^0(\Omega) = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{\mathbf{q}, \lambda} \hbar v_{\lambda}(\mathbf{q}, \Omega) \quad (17)$$

is the zero-point vibrational energy.

The corresponding anharmonic contribution $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{ah}}$ can be obtained from the RSMD result for A_{ion} , Eq. (14), in the following manner. Equation (14) is based on classical Boltzmann statistics and from that equation one must subtract the corresponding classical harmonic component of the ion free energy, $3k_B T(1 - \ln T)$. Assuming only that $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{ah}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}}) = 0$, so that $A_{\text{ion}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}}) = 3k_B T_{\text{ref}}(1 - \ln T_{\text{ref}})$ in Eq. (14), one is left with the result

$$A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{ah}}(\Omega, T) = \frac{T}{T_{\text{ref}}} [E_0(\Omega) + W_{\text{ion}}(\Omega, T)] + \frac{3}{2} k_B T \ln \frac{T}{T_{\text{ref}}} - E_0(\Omega) . \quad (18)$$

We note that physically the anharmonic contribution will vanish at zero temperature, so that $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{ah}}(\Omega, 0) = 0$, and further that $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{ah}}$ remains negligibly small for temperatures below the Debye temperature, $T < \Theta_D$. On the other hand, as a practical matter RSMD simulation cannot be carried down to very low temperatures and is most efficient and accurate numerically when $T \geq T_{\text{ref}} > \Theta_D$. As a compromise, we assume a volume-dependent reference temperature in Eq. (18) of the form $T_{\text{ref}}(\Omega) = x_D \Theta_D(\Omega)$, where x_D is a chosen fixed parameter and the Debye temperature is defined by the equation

$$k_B \Theta_D(\Omega) = \frac{8}{9} E_{\text{ph}}^0(\Omega) . \quad (19)$$

In practice, we find that an optimum choice for x_D is in the range $0.5 \leq x_D \leq 0.8$. For such a choice, $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{ah}}(\Omega, T)$ can be evaluated as a function of temperature at a given volume using Eq. (18) and a single RSMD simulation ranging from $T = x_D \Theta_D$ to $T = T_{\text{max}}^{\text{sol}}$, the maximum temperature of interest in the solid at that volume. To maintain good physical

accuracy, T_{\max}^{sol} should not be taken too far above the solidus melt point, which can be estimated for this purpose by the volume-dependent Lindemann melt temperature

$$T_L(\Omega) = T_m^0 [\Theta_D(\Omega) / \Theta_D(\Omega_m^0)]^2 (\Omega / \Omega_m^0)^{2/3}, \quad (20)$$

with T_m^0 the observed or calculated stable-solid melt temperature at solidus volume Ω_m^0 . One can then take $T_{\max}^{\text{sol}}(\Omega) = x_L^{\max} T_L(\Omega)$, with x_L^{\max} a chosen parameter in the range $1 \leq x_L^{\max} \leq 2$, depending on the magnitude of T_L . At expanded volumes, where T_L is small, a value in the vicinity of $x_L^{\max} = 2$ can be safely used, while at high pressure, where T_L is large, a value near $x_L^{\max} = 1$ is usually required.

C. Ion-thermal free energy $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}$ of the liquid

In the liquid, Eq. (14) can be used directly to obtain the temperature dependence of $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}$, but the challenge is to independently calculate the required reference free energy $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})$ in an accurate and efficient manner. To do this, we take T_{ref} to be a high temperature at the top of the range of interest in the liquid, $T_{\text{ref}} = T_{\max}^{\text{liq}}$, and well above the maximum expected melt temperature in the volume range of interest. We next introduce an appropriate reference system, with potential energy function $U_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{R})$, whose free energy $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{ref}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})$ is accurately known at the required conditions. The principle of adiabatic switching then allows one to calculate $A_{\text{ion}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})$ with equal accuracy by a smooth thermodynamic integration from the reference system to the true system:

$$A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}}) = A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{ref}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}}) + \frac{1}{N} \int_0^1 \langle U(\mathbf{R}) - U_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{R}) \rangle_{\lambda} d\lambda, \quad (21)$$

where here λ is a scaling parameter varying between 0 and 1, and the quantity $\langle U(\mathbf{R}) - U_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{R}) \rangle_{\lambda}$ in the integrand is a thermal average at volume Ω and temperature T_{ref} in the canonical ensemble of the mixed potential energy function

$$U_{\lambda}(\mathbf{R}) = \lambda U(\mathbf{R}) + (1 - \lambda) U_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{R}) . \quad (22)$$

To make the integration in Eq. (21) computationally efficient, however, the reference system used must be a good match to the physical system under consideration, so that $\langle U(\mathbf{R}) - U_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{R}) \rangle_{\lambda} = \langle dU_{\lambda} / d\lambda \rangle_{\lambda}$ varies slowly and smoothly as a function of λ , and only a few points are needed to evaluate the integral accurately.

In most materials, the thermodynamics of the high-temperature liquid is dominated by short-range repulsive forces, and a useful reference system to consider in the context of Eq. (21) is the inverse 12th power potential, r^{-12} , a potential that has been extensively studied via computer simulations and for which an accurate free energy and pair correlation function are known [23]. This choice also allows one to use the powerful technique of thermodynamic perturbation theory (TPT) to optimize the coefficient of the potential. Specifically, for weak-coupling liquid metals at high temperature, where the potential-energy function $U(\mathbf{R})$ can be approximated in the general form

$$U(\mathbf{R}) \approx \bar{U}(\mathbf{R}) = NE_{\text{vol}}(\Omega) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} v_2^{\text{eff}}(R_{ij}, \Omega) , \quad (23)$$

a special version of TPT, known as variational perturbation theory (VPT) [4,7,23,24], provides a rigorous upper bound (ub) on the liquid free energy A_{liq} (in the limit $A_{\text{el}} = 0$):

$$A_{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T) \equiv E_0(\Omega) + A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T) \leq A_{\text{liq}}^{\text{ub}}(\Omega, T) , \quad (24)$$

where

$$A_{\text{liq}}^{\text{ub}}(\Omega, T) = E_{\text{vol}}(\Omega) + A_{\text{ref}}(z, T) + (2\pi / \Omega) \int_0^{\infty} g_{\text{ref}}(r, z) [v_2^{\text{eff}}(r, \Omega) - v_{\text{ref}}(r, z)] r^2 dr . \quad (25)$$

In Eqs. (23) and (25), E_{vol} is a structure-independent volume term and v_2^{eff} is a volume-dependent effective pair potential for the true system, while A_{ref} , g_{ref} , and v_{ref} , are,

respectively, the free energy, pair-correlation function, and pair potential of the r^{-12} reference system [23], with

$$A_{\text{ref}}(z, T) = \sum_{n=1}^5 \frac{1}{n} B_{n+1} z^n k_B T + A_{\text{gas}}(\Omega, T) , \quad (26)$$

$$v_{\text{ref}}(r, z) = \varepsilon(\sigma / r)^{12} \quad (27)$$

and $z = (\sigma^3 / \sqrt{2}\Omega)(\varepsilon / k_B T)^{1/4}$. In Eq. (26) the B_{n+1} are the calculated virial coefficients: $B_2 = 3.6296$, $B_3 = 7.5816$, $B_4 = 9.9792$, $B_5 = 8.4520$, and $B_6 = 4.4$; while A_{gas} is the ideal-gas free energy: $A_{\text{gas}}(\Omega, T) = -[\ln(\Omega / \lambda_{\text{ion}}^3) + 1]k_B T$, with $\lambda_{\text{ion}} = \sqrt{(2\pi\hbar^2) / (M_{\text{ion}} k_B T)}$ and M_{ion} the ion mass.

At each of the volumes of interest and temperature $T = T_{\text{ref}}$, the variational parameter z can be chosen to minimize the right-hand side of Eq. (25), yielding a function $z^{\text{ub}}(\Omega)$, for which $A_{\text{liq}}^{\text{ub}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})$ becomes a close upper bound to the true liquid free energy $A_{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})$ over the entire volume range. A corresponding lower bound (lb) on the free energy can also be established by VPT [24]:

$$A_{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T) \geq A_{\text{liq}}^{\text{lb}}(\Omega, T) \quad (28)$$

where

$$A_{\text{liq}}^{\text{lb}}(\Omega, T) = E_{\text{vol}}(\Omega) + A_{\text{ref}}(z) + (2\pi / \Omega) \int_0^\infty g_{\text{eff}}(r, \Omega) [v_2^{\text{eff}}(r, \Omega) - v_{\text{ref}}(r, z)] r^2 dr . \quad (29)$$

In Eq. (29), $g_{\text{eff}}(r, \Omega)$ is the true-system pair correlation function for $v_2^{\text{eff}}(r, \Omega)$ and must be determined from independent MD simulations at the volumes of interest and $T = T_{\text{ref}}$. The variational parameter z can now be chosen to maximize the right-hand side of Eq. (28) at each volume, yielding $z^{\text{lb}}(\Omega)$ and making $A_{\text{liq}}^{\text{lb}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})$ a close lower bound to $A_{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})$ across the volume range.

An approximate baseline value for $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})$ can be calculated by simply averaging the upper and lower bounds of $A_{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})$ and then subtracting the cold energy:

$$A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}}) \cong \frac{1}{2} [A_{\text{liq}}^{\text{ub}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}}) + A_{\text{liq}}^{\text{lb}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})] - E_0(\Omega) . \quad (30)$$

While Eq. (30) often provides a good estimate, the more reliable and accurate procedure to obtain $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})$ is to calculate first the average of z^{ub} and z^{lb} ,

$$\bar{z}(\Omega) = \frac{1}{2} [z^{\text{ub}}(\Omega) + z^{\text{lb}}(\Omega)] , \quad (31)$$

and then use this result to define the final details of the r^{-12} reference system to be used in Eq. (21) for $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})$. One thereby has as input for Eq. (21)

$$A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{ref}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}}) = A_{\text{ref}}(\bar{z}, T_{\text{ref}}) \quad (32)$$

and

$$U_{\text{ref}}(\mathbf{R}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} ' v_{\text{ref}}(R_{ij}, \bar{z}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} ' \frac{4(\bar{z}\Omega)^4 k_{\text{B}} T_{\text{ref}}}{R_{ij}^{12}} , \quad (33)$$

with A_{ref} given by Eq. (26). It should also be noted in this regard that the approximate form of $U(\mathbf{R}) \approx \bar{U}(\mathbf{R})$ assumed in Eq. (23) is used here only to obtain \bar{z} , and that once \bar{z} is calculated the full potential-energy function $U(\mathbf{R})$ is to be used in Eq. (21). The construction of $\bar{U}(\mathbf{R})$ from $U(\mathbf{R})$ will be discussed below in Sec. IIIB for the case of transition metals described by multi-ion MGPT potentials.

Once the reference free energy $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})$ has been established for use in Eq. (14), that equation can be used directly to calculate the liquid ion-thermal free energy $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T)$ as a function of temperature at given volume from the chosen reference temperature

$T = T_{\text{ref}} = T_{\text{max}}^{\text{liq}}$ down to some desired minimum temperature $T = T_{\text{min}}^{\text{liq}}$ below the melt curve. It is again very often convenient to express the latter temperature as a specific fraction x_L^{min} of the volume-dependent Lindemann melt temperature, such that $T_{\text{min}}^{\text{liq}}(\Omega) = x_L^{\text{min}} T_L(\Omega)$. The optimum value of x_L^{min} depends to some extent on the application at hand. For melting from the stable solid phase, a value in the range $0.8 \leq x_L^{\text{min}} \leq 0.5$ usually works well.

D. Ion-thermal free energy $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{sol}}$ of the metastable solid

Metastable solid phases that are fully mechanically stable at low temperature with all real $T = 0$ phonon frequencies present no special problem, and such cases can be treated in the same manner as the stable solid phase discussed in Sec. IIB above. The challenging case is the one of a metastable phase that is mechanically unstable at low temperature and is only mechanically stabilized at high temperature by anharmonic phonon-phonon interactions, with or without the aid of additional electron-thermal effects. Such a phase has at least some imaginary phonon frequencies at $T = 0$, and hence its quasiharmonic ion-thermal free energy, $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{qh}}$ as given by Eq. (16), does not exist and can't be used to establish the reference energy $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{sol}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})$ that is required in Eq. (14). For this case we have developed a special procedure to determine $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{sol}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})$ along the solidus melt line of the metastable phase in the $A_{\text{el}} = 0$ limit. In that limit, the melt curve for the metastable phase can be determined directly by MD simulation using the accurate two-phase coexistence method [11,25]. From the two-phase melt calculation, one can extract the volume-dependent reference solidus melt temperature $T_{\text{m}}^{\text{sol}}(\Omega)$, melt pressure $P_{\text{m}}^{\text{sol}}(\Omega)$, and melt energy $E_{\text{m}}^{\text{sol}}(\Omega)$ over the entire volume range of interest. Along the melt line, the melt temperature T_{m} , melt pressure P_{m} , and Gibbs free energy, $G = A + P\Omega$, of the liquid and of the metastable solid must be equal, so that $P_{\text{m}} = P_{\text{m}}^{\text{sol}} = P_{\text{m}}^{\text{liq}}$, $T_{\text{m}} = T_{\text{m}}^{\text{sol}} = T_{\text{m}}^{\text{liq}}$, and the Helmholtz free energy of the metastable solid along the solidus melt line can be calculated as

$$A_{\text{sol}}(\Omega_{\text{sol}}, T_m) = A_{\text{liq}}(\Omega_{\text{liq}}, T_m) + P_m(\Omega_{\text{liq}} - \Omega_{\text{sol}}) . \quad (34)$$

For given values of T_m , P_m , and the solidus volume Ω_{sol} on the melt curve, the corresponding liquidus volume Ω_{liq} and free energy $A_{\text{liq}}(\Omega_{\text{liq}}, T_m)$ can be obtained via interpolation on the liquid equation of state (calculated in the $A_{\text{el}} = 0$ limit). With $T_{\text{ref}} = T_m$ and $\Omega = \Omega_{\text{sol}}$, Eq. (34) can be used directly to establish the reference energy

$$A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{sol}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}}) = A_{\text{sol}}(\Omega_{\text{sol}}, T_m) - E_0(\Omega_{\text{sol}}) \quad (35)$$

needed in Eq. (14). One can then apply Eq. (14) both upward in temperature from $T = T_m$ to the desired maximum $T = T_{\text{max}}^{\text{sol}}$ and downward in temperature from $T = T_m$ to an allowable minimum $T = T_{\text{min}}^{\text{sol}}$, which must be established independently for the metastable phase in question. Once $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{sol}}(\Omega, T)$ is thereby calculated for the volumes and temperatures of interest, the electron-thermal component $A_{\text{el}}(\Omega, T)$ can finally be added to it to establish a total free energy and equation of state for the metastable phase.

E. Electron-thermal free energy A_{el} in metals

For metals, the simplest treatment of the additional electron-thermal contribution to the thermodynamics is to use the standard low-temperature expansion of the total internal energy $E(\Omega, T)$ to obtain the leading T^2 contribution to $E_{\text{el}}(\Omega, T)$. Inserting the latter contribution into Eq. (10) with $T_{\text{ref}} = 0$, one then recovers the well-known result

$$A_{\text{el}}(\Omega, T) = -E_{\text{el}}(\Omega, T) = -\frac{\pi^2}{6} (k_B T)^2 \rho(E_F) , \quad (36)$$

where $\rho(E_F)$ is the $T = 0$ density of electronic states at the Fermi level. This treatment is usually adequate in simple metals, where the structure dependence to the density of states is weak and $\rho(E_F)$ can be well approximated by a free-electron form. In transition metals, however, $\rho(E_F)$ is strongly material and structure dependent, so Eq. (36) is only adequate up to modest temperatures in the solid ground-state phase. A more accurate

treatment of A_{el} and E_{el} for high-temperature transition-metal phases has been developed in terms of configuration-averaged, finite-temperature DFT calculations of the electronic entropy $S_{\text{el}} = -\partial A_{\text{el}} / \partial T$ in the hot solid and liquid, using atomic configurations obtained from MGPT-MD simulations [8]. In the prototype case of Ta, the DFT values of electronic entropy thereby obtained in both the hot solid and the liquid can be well fit in the form

$$S_{\text{el}}(\Omega, T) = \alpha(\Omega)T + \gamma(\Omega)T^3 + \dots, \quad (37)$$

so that

$$A_{\text{el}}(\Omega, T) = -\frac{1}{2}\alpha(\Omega)T^2 - \frac{1}{4}\gamma(\Omega)T^4 + \dots \quad (38)$$

and

$$E_{\text{el}}(\Omega, T) = \frac{1}{2}\alpha(\Omega)T^2 + \frac{3}{4}\gamma(\Omega)T^4 + \dots. \quad (39)$$

In the vicinity of melt for Ta, the resulting A_{el} and E_{el} functions differ little in the hot solid and the liquid, and these functions can be adequately approximated by only the first expansion term in Eqs. (38) and (39), respectively. In that limit, one recovers the form of Eq. (36), but with $\rho(E_{\text{F}})$ replaced by an effective volume-dependent density of states $\rho_{\text{eff}}(\Omega) = 3\alpha(\Omega) / (\pi k_{\text{B}})^2$. Even then, the electron-thermal contribution has been found to lower the calculated melt curve in Ta by only a small amount ($< 5\%$) [8-11]. At the same time, the electron-thermal contribution to sensitive thermodynamic derivatives such as the specific heat and thermal expansion coefficient can be much larger, as we specifically demonstrate for Ta in Sec. III.

III. APPLICATION TO TANTALUM

In this section we consider the application of the RSMD-based free-energy methodology described in Sec. II above to the high-pressure phase diagram and multiphase equation of state (EOS) of Ta, as determined by the present Ta6.8x MGPT interatomic potentials and additional electron-thermal contributions. Our treatment will include both ambient and extreme conditions, with the latter extending to as high as 600 GPa in pressure and to 25,000 K in temperature.

A. Ta6.8x MGPT interatomic potentials

Within DFT quantum mechanics, generalized pseudopotential theory (GPT) provides a first-principles approach to multi-ion interatomic potentials in d -band transition metals [26], with a the real-space total-energy functional for the bulk material obtained at $T_{\text{el}} = 0$ in the general form

$$E_{\text{tot}}(\mathbf{R}; \Omega) = NE_{\text{vol}}(\Omega) + \frac{1}{2} \sum'_{i,j} v_2(ij; \Omega) + \frac{1}{6} \sum'_{i,j,k} v_3(ijk; \Omega) + \frac{1}{24} \sum'_{i,j,k,l} v_4(ijkl; \Omega) , \quad (40)$$

where the prime on each summation sign indicates the exclusion of all self-interaction terms from the summation. The leading volume term E_{vol} in Eq. (40), as well as the two-ion pair potential v_2 and the three- and four-ion angular-force potentials, v_3 and v_4 , depend explicitly on the atomic volume Ω but are structure independent and transferable to all bulk ion configurations, either ordered or disordered. The simplified *model* GPT or MGPT [6-11] derives from the GPT through a series of systematic approximations applied to E_{vol} and the potentials v_n , approximations that are valid for mid-period transition metals with nearly half-filled d bands. These two main approximations are (i) the neglect of explicit sp - d hybridization contributions to the potentials v_n , contributions which destructively interfere for half-filled d bands; and (ii) the introduction of highly symmetrical canonical d bands [6], which allow the remaining d -state band-structure contributions to the potentials to be evaluated analytically in terms of a single radial

function $f(r)$ and three universal angular functions, L , P and M , that depend only on d symmetry.

In the MGPT, the two-ion pair potential consists of four main contributions:

$$v_2(r, \Omega) = v_2^{sp}(r, \Omega) + v_2^{hc}(r, \Omega) + v_a(\Omega)[f(r)]^4 - v_b(\Omega)[f(r)]^2, \quad (41)$$

where v_2^{sp} is a pseudopotential-derived screened ion-ion potential for the s and p valence electrons; v_2^{hc} is a repulsive “hard-core” potential, arising mainly from d -state non-orthogonality effects; and v_a and v_b are volume-dependent coefficients for the direct d -band contributions. In the latter two terms, $f(r) = (1.8R_{ws}/r)^p$, where R_{ws} is the Wigner-Seitz radius and p is a weakly volume-dependent parameter, with a Gaussian cutoff introduced into $f(r)$ beyond the bcc second-neighbor distance [27]. For ideal canonical d bands, $p = 2\ell + 1 = 5$ with $\ell = 2$, but in all Ta applications, including the present Ta6.8x potentials, we have taken $p = 4$ at the observed equilibrium volume $\Omega_0 = 121.6$ a.u., and then allowed p to increase monotonically for decreasing Ω , as shown in Fig. 1(a).

The angular-force multi-ion potentials v_3 and v_4 in Eq. (40) reflect directional bonding contributions arising from partial d -band filling, and in the MGPT these potentials are given by corresponding multi-ion d -band functions, which can be expressed in terms of three and six radial distances, r_n , respectively, and dependent angles, θ_n :

$$v_3(r_1, r_2, r_3; \Omega) = v_c(\Omega)f(r_1)f(r_2)f(r_3)L(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) + v_d(\Omega)\{[f(r_1)f(r_2)]^2P(\theta_3) \\ + [f(r_2)f(r_3)]^2P(\theta_1) + [f(r_3)f(r_1)]^2P(\theta_2)\} \quad (42)$$

and

$$v_4(r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, r_5, r_6; \Omega) = v_e(\Omega)[f(r_1)f(r_2)f(r_3)f(r_4)M(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_4, \theta_5, \theta_6) \\ + f(r_3)f(r_2)f(r_6)f(r_5)M(\theta_7, \theta_8, \theta_9, \theta_{10}, \theta_5, \theta_{12}) \\ + f(r_1)f(r_6)f(r_4)f(r_3)M(\theta_{11}, \theta_{12}, \theta_5, \theta_6, \theta_3, \theta_4)] \quad (43)$$




Fig. 1 Volume dependence of the MGPT potential parameters and pair potential for Ta_{6.8}x. (a) Radial function exponent p for $f(r)$ (right vertical scale) and d -band potential coefficients v_α (left vertical scale). (b) Two-ion pair potential v_2 for selected volumes, in x increments of 0.04 with $x = (\Omega/\Omega_0)^{1/3}$.

where v_c , v_d , and v_e are additional volume-dependent d -band coefficients. The specific three- and four-ion geometries assumed in Eqs. (42) and (43) are defined in Figs. 4a and 6, respectively, of Ref. [6].

In the MGPT, the two-ion potential contributions v_2^{sp} and v_2^{hc} in Eq. (41) are determined from first-principles, as in the full GPT. The remaining five d -band coefficients v_a , v_b , v_c , v_d , and v_e in Eqs. (41)-(43) are also well-defined material parameters, but to compensate for the approximations introduced into the MGPT, these latter quantities, together with the volume term E_{vol} in Eq. (40), are fit to a combination of experimental and first-principles DFT data on basic material properties. Specifically one fits, as a function of volume in the stable-solid bcc phase, a blend of experimental data at ambient pressure and DFT data at high pressure on the cold equation of state (EOS), the shear elastic moduli C' and C_{44} , the unrelaxed vacancy formation energy E_{vac}^0 , and the Debye temperature Θ_D , subject to the additional constraint of the compressibility sum rule, which reduces the number of independent parameters from six to five. The calculated

volume dependence of each of the d -band coefficients v_α is shown in Fig. 1(a) for the present case of Ta6.8x, where several technical improvements in the fitting scheme, as described below, have been introduced. From those results, one can see that the fundamental theoretical MGPT requirements [6], $v_b \gg v_a > 0$ and $v_e > v_d > 0$, are all well maintained.

Refinement of our basic MGPT fitting scheme has taken place over a number of generations of bcc transition-metal potentials [6-8, 27], and the present Ta6.8x potentials represent a systematic numerical improvement over the previous Ta4 potentials [8,27] in three specific areas. First, a smoother blend of the input experimental and DFT data has been used through explicit analytic representations of that data, including (i) a universal-equation-of-state representation [28] of the cold EOS functions $E_0(\Omega)$ and $P_0(\Omega)$; (ii) power-series representations of $C'(P)$ and $C_{44}(P)$ in terms of pressure derivatives of the shear moduli; and (iii) explicit expression of the volume dependence of $\Theta_D(\Omega)$ in terms of the measured Grüneisen parameter. While these analytic representations of the input data do improve the overall smoothness of the fitted parameters $E_{\text{vol}}(\Omega)$ and $v_\alpha(\Omega)$, they do at the same time restrict the high-pressure limit of the $T = 0$ treatment to about 420 GPa in Ta6.8x, as compared to 1000 GPa in Ta4. The second area of improvement in Ta6.8x has been a more robust analytic fit to the hard-core potential $v_2^{\text{hc}}(r, \Omega)$ in Eq. (41), allowing the full pair potential $v_2(r, \Omega)$ to be reliably extended to smaller separations, which are of direct interest in the high-temperature liquid.

Finally, these two general improvements combined have allowed the MGPT Ta6.8x potentials to be defined on a finer volume mesh, quantified by the reduced volume parameter $x = (\Omega / \Omega_0)^{1/3}$. Specifically, we have calculated the potentials on a uniform x mesh in increments of 0.01 over a range $0.80 \leq x \leq 1.08$, corresponding to 29 atomic volumes in all. Representative behavior of the Ta6.8x potentials is shown in Fig. 1(b) for the pair potential v_2 , in Fig. 2(a) for the three-ion potential v_3 , and in Fig 2(b) for the four-ion potential v_4 . Note that v_2 ranges from strongly attractive at large volume to completely repulsive at small volume, while v_3 is generally repulsive, but small in




Fig. 2 Angular and volume dependence of the Ta6.8x multi-ion MGPT potentials v_3 [left panel (a)] and v_4 [right panel (b)] for specific near-neighbor configurations at selected volumes, in x increments of 0.04 with $x = (\Omega / \Omega_0)^{1/3}$.

magnitude, and v_4 is significantly larger but necessarily oscillatory. Overall, the numerical improvements in the Ta6.8x potentials lead to more accurate calculated thermodynamics from QHLD and from MGPT-MD simulations than is obtained with the Ta4 potentials.

B. QHLD, MD, and VPT implementation of MGPT potentials

In the present work, we have applied the Ta6.8x potentials in QHLD calculations and MGPT-MD simulations assuming a potential-energy function $U(\mathbf{R}) \equiv E_{\text{tot}}(\mathbf{R}, \Omega)$ in the ion equations of motion and using the advanced matrix representation of the MGPT total-energy functional [9], which provides maximum computational efficiency and accuracy. In this implementation, the angular functions L , P , and M in Eqs. (42) and (43) are evaluated on the fly during an MD simulation through d -state matrix multiplication, while the multi-ion forces that move the ions are determined analytically. All of the present MGPT-MD simulations have been performed in standard fixed-shape cubic

computational cells at constant volume, using 250-ion ensembles for the bcc and liquid phases and 256-ion ensembles for the metastable fcc phase. Constant simulation temperature has been maintained with a Gaussian thermostat [7, 29-30]. The constant-volume MGPT-MD simulations have been performed along selected isochores at x increments of 0.04 between $x = 0.80$ and $x = 1.08$, corresponding to a direct treatment of 8 of the 29 volumes on the full x mesh. MD-derived thermodynamic data at intermediate volumes have been obtained by interpolation. The QHLD calculations of bcc quasiharmonic phonons and corresponding ion-thermal thermodynamic functions, on the other hand, have been performed directly on all 29 x -mesh volumes.

The volume-dependent effective pair potential v_2^{eff} that is required in VPT to obtain \bar{z} , the optimized reference potential $v_{\text{ref}}(r, \bar{z})$, and the liquid reference free energy $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{ref}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})$ for Eq. (21), is calculated numerically by averaging over the MGPT multi-ion potentials v_3 and v_4 in the liquid at temperature T_{ref} :

$$v_2^{\text{eff}}(R_{ij}; \Omega) = v_2(R_{ij}, \Omega) + \frac{1}{3} \left\langle \sum_k v_3(ijk; \Omega) \right\rangle + \frac{1}{12} \left\langle \sum_{k,l} v_4(ijkl; \Omega) \right\rangle. \quad (44)$$

In the present Ta applications, we have taken $T_{\text{ref}} = 25,000$ K. The behavior of v_2^{eff} is compared with both that of v_2 and that of the corresponding optimized r^{-12} reference potential v_{ref} in Fig. 3 at the volume $\Omega = \Omega_0$. Note that v_{ref} is a good match to v_2^{eff} in the short-range repulsive region important to the high-temperature liquid and that v_2^{eff} is everywhere more repulsive than v_2 .

C. Stable-solid bcc free energy

In agreement with first-principles DFT calculations [32,33], Ta modeled with multi-ion MGPT potentials is both mechanically and thermodynamically stable in the bcc phase at $T = 0$ over the present pressure range, which extends up to 420 GPa at this temperature. Real quasiharmonic phonons frequencies are calculated throughout the Brillouin zone at all volumes within this pressure range. The quality of the MGPT phonons obtained with




Fig. 3 Effective pair potential v_2^{eff} in high-temperature liquid Ta at 25,000 K for $\Omega = \Omega_0$, as calculated from the present Ta 6.8x MGPT potentials v_2 , v_3 and v_4 via Eq. (44) and as used to obtain an optimized r^{-12} reference potential v_{ref} for the same conditions.

the Ta6.8x potentials was previously illustrated in Fig. 5 of Ref. [11], where calculated frequencies at the [100] and [110] zone boundaries were compared with DFT results [32] for a range of volumes and with experiment [34] at ambient conditions. As discussed in Ref. [11], there is good agreement among the MGPT, DFT, and experimental results, except for the anomalous transverse $T_2[110]$ phonon frequency, which is underestimated with current MGPT Ta6.8x potentials.

Regarding MGPT calculation of the quasi-harmonic component of the ion-thermal free energy, the Brillouin-zone sums in Eq. (16) for $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{qh}}$ and Eq. (17) for E_{ph}^0 have been

carried out over 506 \mathbf{q} points in the irreducible ($1/48^{\text{th}}$) wedge of the bcc BZ at each of the 29 volumes on our fine volume mesh. The volume dependence of the Debye temperature $\Theta_D(\Omega)$ so calculated from Eqs. (17) and (19) with the present Ta6.8x potentials is shown in Fig. 4a and compared with the result obtained from the previous Ta4 potentials, where both results have been constrained by experiment at ambient conditions [34]. A corresponding comparison is made in Fig 4b for the quasiharmonic ion-Grüneisen parameter $\gamma_{\text{ion}}^{\text{qh}}$, as calculated in the high-temperature limit, $T \gg \Theta_D$, where one has $\gamma_{\text{ion}}^{\text{qh}}(\Omega) = \Omega P_{\text{ion}}^{\text{qh}} / E_{\text{ion}}^{\text{qh}}$. While the improved Ta6.8x potentials and accompanying finer volume mesh have little direct effect on Θ_D , they do clearly impact derivative quantities like $\gamma_{\text{ion}}^{\text{qh}}$. As also shown in Fig. 4b, the measured Grüneisen parameter at volume $\Omega = \Omega_0$ and room temperature [35] lies close to, but halfway between, the Ta4 and Ta6.8x quasiharmonic results.

In stable solid phases, the generally larger computational challenge is to obtain accurate anharmonic free energies, and this is particularly so in the present Ta example, where $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{ah}}$ is small and only 1-5 mRy in magnitude near melt. Here we use this challenge to demonstrate both the power of RSMD simulation so applied and the utility of isolating anharmonic effects through Eq. (18). To obtain high convergence of $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{ah}}$ to 0.1 mRy, which is needed to calculate smooth thermodynamic derivatives at high temperature, has required integrating over the temperature range from $x_D \Theta_D$ to $x_L^{\text{max}} T_L$ very slowly, with 3×10^6 time steps at $x = 1.08$, increasing to 8×10^6 time steps for $x \leq 0.92$. We have so calculated $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{ah}}$ along our eight simulation isochores ranging from $x = 0.80$ to $x = 1.08$, as illustrated in Fig. 5a, with temperature-limit parameters $x_D = 0.8$ and $x_L^{\text{max}} = 1 - 2$. As also demonstrated in Fig. 5a, each simulated isochore can be smoothly fit with a polynomial expansion of the form

$$A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{ah}}(\Omega, T) = A_2 T^2 + A_3 T^3 + A_4 T^4 + A_5 T^5 + A_6 T^6, \quad (45)$$

where the A_n are volume-dependent coefficients. The leading T^2 term in this expansion




Fig. 4 Volume dependence of the Debye temperature Θ_D [left panel (a)] and the quasi-harmonic ion-Grüneisen parameter γ_{ion}^{qh} for $T \gg \Theta_D$ [right panel (b)] in bcc Ta, as calculated from the present MGPT Ta6.8x potentials, and as compared with corresponding results obtained from the previous Ta4 potentials [8,27] and from experiment at ambient conditions [34,35].

ensures the proper behavior of A_{ion}^{ah} at low temperature and effectively corrects the small error incurred by starting the RSMD simulation at finite temperature. Consistent with Eqs. (9) and (15), the corresponding anharmonic component of the total internal energy is then given by

$$E_{ion}^{ah}(\Omega, T) = -A_2 T^2 - 2A_3 T^3 - 3A_4 T^4 - 4A_5 T^5 - 5A_6 T^6. \quad (46)$$

The smooth values of A_{ion}^{ah} and E_{ion}^{ah} so calculated on the eight isochores have then been extended to the full 29-volume mesh by numerical interpolation. Selected isotherms of A_{ion}^{ah} on the full volume mesh are displayed in Fig. 5b, and reveal that A_{ion}^{ah} generally increases for Ta in both expansion and compression with a minimum occurring in the 80-100 a.u. volume range. Finally, values of the anharmonic pressure, $P_{ion}^{ah} = -\partial A_{ion}^{ah} / \partial \Omega$, have been calculated by direct numerical differentiation on the full volume mesh.




Fig. 5 Anharmonic free energy in bcc Ta, as obtained from MGPT-RSMD simulations with the present Ta6.8x potentials. (a) Five selected isochores of the eight total calculated, with $x = (\Omega/\Omega_0)^{1/3}$. Shown are both the raw simulation data (short dashed lines) and smooth fits (solid lines) to the data via Eq. (45). (b) Four selected high-temperature isotherms obtained via interpolation on the eight fitted isochores and displayed for $T < T_L(\Omega)$.

An independent check on the numerical accuracy of $E_{\text{ion}}^{\text{ah}}$ obtained from Eq. (46) can be made as follows. If one performs a standard MD simulation at constant volume and temperature, $E_{\text{ion}}^{\text{ah}}$ can be extracted from the total simulated ion-thermal energy $E_{\text{ion}}^{\text{sol}}$ as $E_{\text{ion}}^{\text{ah}} = E_{\text{ion}}^{\text{sol}} - 3k_B T$. From a well-equilibrated MGPT-MD simulation near melt conditions of $\Omega = \Omega_0$ and $T = 4000$ K, we thereby have obtained $E_{\text{ion}}^{\text{ah}} = -0.6 \pm 0.2$ mRy, where the statistics on $E_{\text{ion}}^{\text{sol}}$ have been accumulated for 10 ps. This result agrees with the corresponding value of $E_{\text{ion}}^{\text{ah}} = -0.6 \pm 0.1$ mRy calculated from Eq. (46) for the same volume and temperature.

With a bcc cold energy $E_0 = E_0^{\text{bcc}}$, the total free energy of the stable solid,

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{\text{bcc}}(\Omega, T) &= E_0^{\text{bcc}}(\Omega) + A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{bcc}}(\Omega, T) + A_{\text{el}}(\Omega, T) \\
&= E_0^{\text{bcc}}(\Omega) + A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{qh}}(\Omega, T) + A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{ah}}(\Omega, T) + A_{\text{el}}(\Omega, T) \quad ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{47}$$

has then been calculated for bcc Ta on the full volume mesh from its component parts, together with corresponding results also obtained for the total internal energy E_{bcc} and total pressure P_{bcc} , completing the full bcc equation of state. A sensitive check on the physical accuracy of the thermal components of A_{bcc} and E_{bcc} can be made in terms of measured thermodynamic derivatives, namely, the temperature dependence of the constant-pressure specific heat C_p and of the thermal expansion coefficient $\beta = \Omega^{-1}(\partial\Omega/\partial T)_p$ at ambient pressure. We compare our calculated results for these quantities in three limits against experimental data [36-40] in Fig. 6. The limits so treated are first the full theory, with calculated quasiharmonic, anharmonic and electron-thermal contributions; second, the quasiharmonic plus anharmonic limit, with electron-thermal contributions omitted ($A_{\text{el}} = 0$); and third, the quasiharmonic limit, with both anharmonic and electron-thermal contributions omitted ($A_{\text{el}} = A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{ah}} = 0$).

Regarding the specific heat C_p in Fig. 6a, the full theory is in close agreement with the experimental data of Hultgren *et al.* [36] up to about 2600 K. The anharmonic contribution to this result is seen to be very small, while the much larger electron-thermal contribution is clearly essential to the agreement above room temperature. The observed steep rise in C_p above 2600 K in the Hultgren *et al.* data is not captured by the present theory, but this feature is well known to be sensitive to impurities and other experimental factors, so this shortcoming is not necessarily significant. In this regard, and as also shown in Fig. 6a, the full theory result for C_p at melt is in good agreement with the value derived from dynamic isobaric expansion measurements [37-39].

Regarding the thermal expansion coefficient β in Fig. 6b, the full theory is in good accord with the measured data of Touloukian *et al.* [40] up to about 400 K and still in reasonable agreement to 1000 K. Above 1000 K, however, the data has large error bars and begins to diverge from the theory, and only provisional values of thermal expansion




Fig. 6 Thermodynamic derivatives in bcc Ta at zero pressure, as calculated in the quasi-harmonic (qh), quasiharmonic plus anharmonic (qh+ah), and quasiharmonic plus anharmonic plus electron-thermal (qh+ah+el) limits of the present theory, and as compared to experiment. (a) Constant-pressure specific heat C_p , with the measured data from Ref. [36] (solid circles) and Refs. [37-39] (solid square); (b) Thermal expansion coefficient β , with the measured data from Ref. [40] (solid circles).

were measured above 2000 K. In a similar manner, the Touloukian *et al.* data was also found to lie above the earlier EAM-MD calculations of β in Ta by Strachan *et al.* [41].

D. Liquid free energy

In the liquid, the biggest computational challenge is to calculate an accurate reference ion-thermal free energy $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})$ along a high-temperature isotherm. In the case of Ta we have successfully applied the combined VPT and TI methodology described above in Sec. IIC to that task at a reference temperature $T_{\text{ref}} = 25,000$ K, with a choice of a bcc cold energy $E_0(\Omega) = E_0^{\text{bcc}}(\Omega)$. Using variational perturbation theory, upper and lower bounds to the free energy and an averaged variational parameter $\bar{z}(\Omega)$ were established at each of the eight volumes on our simulation mesh. Using thermodynamic integration

from an r^{-12} reference system, optimized at each volume using \bar{z} , to the true system, $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})$ was then calculated on the simulation mesh from Eq. (21). At each volume, only five points in the integral contained in Eq. (21) were necessary to obtain $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})$ to sub-mRy numerical accuracy. Our final result for $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})$ is plotted in Fig. 7a and compared with the approximate baseline VPT value of this quantity as calculated from Eq. (30), which overestimates $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})$ by 2 mRy or less at small volumes, but underestimates this quantity by as much as 31 mRy at large volumes.

With $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})$ thereby established, MGPT-RSMD simulations of $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T)$ were then performed downward in temperature from T_{ref} to $0.5T_L(\Omega)$ along the eight simulation isochores. Raw simulation data for $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T)$ together with smooth analytic fits to the data are shown in Fig. 7b for four selected isochores. The MGPT-RSMD simulation results were obtained with 2×10^6 time steps at all volumes and were found to be well converged. Similar good results were also obtained with as few as 5×10^5 time steps, and increases first to 1×10^6 time steps and then to 2×10^6 time steps produced little change in the results.

The analytic fits of the ion-thermal free-energy data shown in Fig. 7b were obtained using the form

$$A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T) = C_0\tau - C_1\tau \ln \tau + C_2\tau(\tau - 1) + C_3\tau(\tau^2 - 1) + C_4\tau(\tau^3 - 1) + C_5\tau(\tau^4 - 1) + C_6\tau(\tau^5 - 1) \quad (48)$$

where $\tau = T/T_{\text{ref}}$ and where the C_n are volume-dependent coefficients that include the constraint $C_0(\Omega) = A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})$. Consistent with Eq. (9), the corresponding ion-thermal component of the total internal energy is given by

$$E_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T) = C_1\tau - C_2\tau^2 - 2C_3\tau^3 - 3C_4\tau^4 - 4C_5\tau^5 - 5C_6\tau^6, \quad (49)$$

which is then analogous to Eq. (45) for $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{ah}}$ except for the necessary addition of a term




Fig. 7 Ion-thermal free energy $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}$ in liquid Ta, as obtained with the present Ta6.8x MGPT potentials. (a) Reference isotherm $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})$ for $T_{\text{ref}} = 25,000$ K, calculated both approximately from variational perturbation theory (VPT), using Eq. (30), and more accurately from thermodynamic integration (TI), using Eq. (21). (b) Four selected isochores of the eight total calculated via MGPT-RSMD simulation, in x increments of 0.08 with $x = (\Omega / \Omega_0)^{1/3}$. Shown are both the raw simulation data (short dashed lines) and smooth fits (solid lines) to the data using Eq. (48).

linear in the temperature. While Eqs. (48) and (49) can be used directly in this form, with six independent fitting parameters at each volume, in practice it is more desirable to introduce an additional constraint on $E_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}$ at the reference temperature:

$$E_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}}) = C_1 - C_2 - 2C_3 - 3C_4 - 4C_5 - 5C_6. \quad (50)$$

Here we have calculated accurate values of $E_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T_{\text{ref}})$ for Ta at the eight volumes on our simulation mesh with independent MGPT-MD simulations. Combining Eq. (50) with Eqs. (48) and (49) not only ensures that both $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}$ and $E_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}$ are accurately maintained along the $T = T_{\text{ref}}$ isotherm, but it produces a very robust fit of $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}$ along all eight

MGPT-RSMD isochores in liquid Ta, as illustrated in Fig. 7b. The values of $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}$ and $E_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}$ so calculated have been extended to the full 29-volume mesh by numerical interpolation. Values of the ion-thermal pressure, $P_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}} = -\partial A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}} / \partial \Omega$, have then been calculated by direct numerical differentiation on the full volume mesh.

The total free energy of the liquid,

$$A_{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T) = E_0^{\text{bcc}}(\Omega) + A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{liq}}(\Omega, T) + A_{\text{el}}(\Omega, T) , \quad (51)$$

has been calculated for Ta on the full volume mesh from its three component parts, together with corresponding results obtained for the total internal energy E_{liq} and total pressure P_{liq} . As for the bcc solid, a sensitive physical check on the thermal components of A_{liq} and E_{liq} can be made in terms of the temperature dependence of the thermodynamic derivatives C_p and β at ambient pressure. We display our calculated values of C_p and β for liquid Ta in Figs. 8a and 8b, respectively, as obtained both from the full theory, with ion- and electron-thermal components, and in the ion-thermal only limit ($A_{\text{el}} = 0$). As expected, the inclusion of the electron-thermal component has a big impact on the calculated derivatives, and our results in the liquid are very consistent with those obtained in the bcc solid (Fig. 6). With electron-thermal effects included, we find that C_p at melt rises from $4.4k_B$ in the bcc solid to $5.6k_B$ in the liquid, which is in good agreement with the temperature-corrected isobaric data of Shaner *et al.* [37] as reported by Gathers [38]. On the other hand, Berthault *et al.* [39] find a much smaller rise of C_p to only $4.6k_B$ in the liquid in their isobaric measurements. Similarly, with the full theory we find that β at melt rises from $2.7 \times 10^{-5} \text{K}^{-1}$ in the bcc solid to $4.0 \times 10^{-5} \text{K}^{-1}$ in the liquid. In this case, the liquid result at melt is in close agreement with the Berthault *et al.* [39] data, but 20% less than inferred from Gathers [38].

E. Melt curve and equation of state

Using the detailed computational methodology discussed above in Secs. IIIC and IIID,




Fig. 8 Thermodynamic derivatives in liquid Ta at zero pressure, as calculated both without electron-thermal contributions (ion only) and with electron-thermal contributions (ion + el) in the present theory, and as compared to experimental isobaric expansion data from Ref. [38] (iso83) and Ref. [39] (iso86). (a) Constant-pressure specific heat C_p , with the measured data at melt; (b) Thermal expansion coefficient β .

full-range equation of state (EOS) tables for the bcc and liquid phases of Ta have been assembled. These tables include the total pressure P , the total internal energy E , and the total free energy A evaluated as a function of volume and temperature on the full 29-volume mesh and at temperature intervals of 100 K up to 25,000 K. In this section, we use these results to examine the equilibrium melt curve connecting the bcc-solid and liquid EOS surfaces, as well as basic pressure-volume compression curves, namely, the 300-K isotherm and the principal shock Hugoniot, which can be directly compared to experiment.

The melt curve has been calculated here using the standard Helmholtz free-energy construction, obtaining melt temperatures T_m as a function of pressure in 100 K intervals up to melt pressures P_m approaching 500 GPa. To examine melt sensitivities in Ta, we have calculated the melt curve not only with the full theory that we have developed, but

also in the limit of no electron-thermal contributions ($A_{\text{el}} = 0$) and in the limit of both no electron-thermal and no anharmonic contributions ($A_{\text{el}} = A_{\text{ah}} = 0$). The three Ta melt curves so obtained are compared in Fig. 9a. As expected, the effect of electron-thermal contributions is found to be small, lowering the melt curve by only 75-200 K, or less than 3%, across the entire pressure range considered. At the same time, and as previously discussed in Ref. [11], the bcc free-energy melt curve calculated in the $A_{\text{el}} = 0$ limit is in very good agreement with the corresponding result obtained in two-phase MGPT-MD melt simulations, thus validating the computational accuracy of our melt calculation in this limit. As also demonstrated in Fig. 9a, the effect of anharmonic contributions on the Ta melt curve is considerably larger, especially at low pressures below 100 GPa, where T_{m} is lowered by up to 725 K or over 20%, and at very high pressures above 250 GPa, where T_{m} is lowered by up to 550 K. This finding is consistent with the fact that the anharmonic free energy in the bcc solid is generally calculated to be minimum at intermediate volumes and pressures, as was shown above in Fig. 5.

Our full-theory melt curve for Ta is compared against static and dynamic experimental data in Fig. 9b. The calculated zero-pressure melt temperature of $T_{\text{m}} = 3349$ K and melt-curve slope of $dT_{\text{m}} / dP_{\text{m}} = 52.2$ K/GPa compare well with the values of 3270 K and 58.8 K/GPa, respectively, obtained from isobaric data [37,38]. At intermediate pressures, the recent static diamond-anvil-cell (DAC) data of Dewaele *et al.* in Ta [42], obtained in the pressure range 52-113 GPa, lie below our calculated melt curve, but these data also have large temperature errors bars of 500-1000 K. At high pressure, the intersection of the present calculated principal Hugoniot in the bcc solid with the melt curve is in excellent agreement with the measured onset of shock melting [43,44] at 295 GPa and 9700 K.

Our corresponding full-theory pressure-volume relations for the room-temperature (300-K) isotherm and principal Hugoniot are plotted in Fig. 10 and again compared against static and dynamic experimental data. Figure 10a displays the results for these quantities in the bcc solid below about 300 GPa. Our calculated 300-K isotherm is in good agreement with the DAC data of Cynn and Yoo [45], measured to 174 GPa, and with the DAC data of Dewaele *et al.* [46], measured to 94 GPa. Similarly, our calculated bcc




Fig. 9 High-pressure melting in Ta, as calculated from the present bcc-solid and liquid free energies. (a) Sensitivity of the melt curve to electron-thermal (A_{el}) and anharmonic (A_{ah}) free-energy contributions; (b) Full-theory melt curve and principal Hugoniot, with comparison to experimental isobaric [37,38], DAC [42] and shock [43,44] melt data.

Hugoniot, whose temperature ranges from 300 K to about 10,000 K, is in good agreement with the shock data on Mitchell and Nellis [47]. Figure 10b displays our calculated Hugoniot in both the bcc solid and the liquid, extending to 600 GPa. Reasonably good agreement with shock data [47,48] is maintained in the liquid as well, although above 400 GPa the calculated Hugoniot pressure is slightly underestimated. Also note that, as expected and in contrast to the calculated temperature-pressure Hugoniot (Fig. 9b), melting produces no visible discontinuity in the pressure-volume Hugoniot.

F. Metastable fcc free energy

We finally turn to the case of calculating the free energy for a metastable phase, using the fcc phase of Ta as a prototype example. Fcc is one of a number of structures in Ta that is predicted to be mechanically unstable at $T = 0$, with calculated imaginary quasi-harmonic phonon frequencies, but that is stabilized at high temperature and pressure by large anharmonic effects [11,33]. In particular, previous MGPT-MD simulations with Ta6.8x




Fig. 10 High-pressure EOS properties in Ta, as obtained from the present bcc and liquid equations of state and compared to experiment. (a) Room-temperature (300-K) isotherm and principal Hugoniot calculated in the bcc phase (solid lines), and compared, respectively, to static DAC data (solid circles from Ref. [45] and open diamonds from Ref. [46]) and dynamic shock data (solid squares from Ref. [47]); (b) Principal Hugoniot calculated in both the bcc solid and the liquid, and compared to shock data (solid squares from Ref. [47] and solid diamonds from Ref. [48]).

potentials [11] have shown that fcc Ta displays good mechanical stability near melt, yet remains thermodynamically less stable than bcc Ta, with a melt temperature that lies everywhere below that of bcc. Large-cell two-phase MGPT-MD simulations with 74,088 atoms were used in Ref. [11] to calculate a smooth fcc melt curve to 440 GPa in the $A_{el} = 0$ limit. In the process, accurate data were obtained on the melt temperature T_m^{fcc} , melt pressure P_m^{fcc} , and solidus volume Ω_{sol}^{fcc} , data that we have used here to establish a reference free energy for the fcc phase. Toward this end, we have carefully fit the fcc melt data so obtained in the analytic forms

$$T_m^{fcc}(x) = (3.6661 - 9.8710x + 9.0306x^2 - 2.7966x^3) \times 10^5 \text{ K} \quad (52)$$

and

$$P_m^{\text{fcc}}(x) = (2.8619 - 8.1213x + 7.7248x^2 - 2.4643x^3) \times 10^4 \text{ GPa} , \quad (53)$$

where $x = (\Omega_{\text{sol}}^{\text{fcc}} / \Omega_0)^{1/3}$ within the restricted range $1.04 \leq x \leq 0.80$. Combining the use of Eqs. (52) and (53) with interpolation on the $A_{\text{el}} = 0$ liquid equation of state for Ta, we have calculated the fcc ion-thermal free energy $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{fcc}}(\Omega, T_m^{\text{fcc}})$ along the melt curve using Eqs. (34) and (35), with a cold energy $E_0^{\text{fcc}}(\Omega)$ for the fcc structure. Because the fcc melt curve lies significantly lower in temperature than the bcc melt curve, the accuracy of this procedure was improved by constructing a special liquid free energy and EOS in which the MGPT-RSMD simulations for the liquid were taken to lower temperature. Specifically, the liquid simulations for this purpose were performed downward in temperature from 25,000 K to 1000 K, instead of down to $0.5T_L$ as in Sec. IIID above. These calculations were carried out along the eight simulation isochores, using 1×10^6 time steps in each case, with extension to the full 29-volume mesh by interpolation.

To obtain fcc ion-thermal free energies above and below the reference temperature $T_{\text{ref}} = T_m^{\text{fcc}}$, we have used the reference free energy $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{fcc}}(\Omega, T_m^{\text{fcc}})$ in Eq. (14) and performed MGPT-RSMD simulations to higher and lower temperature along the seven simulation isochores contained within the restricted volume range of Eq. (52) and (53), using a total of 1×10^6 time steps in each case. The simulations to higher temperature were carried out from T_m^{fcc} to $T_{\text{max}}^{\text{fcc}} = 17,500$ K, while those to lower temperature were performed from T_m^{fcc} to $0.5T_m^{\text{fcc}}$ K, which we estimate to be an approximate lower bound in temperature for the mechanical stability of the fcc structure. The fcc ion-thermal free-energy data so obtained were then fit with an analytic form analogous to Eq. (48) for the liquid:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{fcc}}(\Omega, T) = & B_0\tau - B_1\tau \ln \tau + B_2\tau(\tau - 1) + B_3\tau(\tau^2 - 1) + B_4\tau(\tau^3 - 1) \\ & + B_5\tau(\tau^4 - 1) + B_6\tau(\tau^5 - 1) \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

where $\tau = T / T_{\text{max}}^{\text{fcc}}$, the B_n are volume-dependent coefficients, and $B_0(\Omega) = A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{fcc}}(\Omega, T_{\text{max}}^{\text{fcc}})$.

From thermodynamic consistency, the corresponding ion-thermal component of the total fcc internal energy is given by

$$E_{\text{ion}}^{\text{fcc}}(\Omega, T) = B_1 \tau - B_2 \tau^2 - 2B_3 \tau^3 - 3B_4 \tau^4 - 4B_5 \tau^5 - 5B_6 \tau^6 . \quad (55)$$

The values of $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{fcc}}$ and $E_{\text{ion}}^{\text{fcc}}$ so calculated have then been extended to a fine 25-volume mesh by numerical interpolation. The fcc ion-thermal pressure, $P_{\text{ion}}^{\text{fcc}} = -\partial A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{fcc}} / \partial \Omega$, has been calculated by direct numerical differentiation on the fine volume mesh.

To test the numerical accuracy and self-consistency of our calculation of $A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{fcc}}(\Omega, T)$, the total fcc free energy in the $A_{\text{el}} = 0$ limit was obtained by adding the cold energy $E_0^{\text{fcc}}(\Omega)$ and assembling an fcc EOS table in the 2000–17,500 K temperature range. This result was then used together with the corresponding liquid free energy and EOS discussed above to perform a Helmholtz free-energy calculation of the fcc melt curve. The free-energy melt curve so calculated is compared with the input two-phase melt data in Fig. 11. The agreement is seen to be excellent. We have also performed additional MGPT-MD simulations to determine actual approximate upper and lower temperature bounds on fcc mechanical stability, and these are plotted as a function of pressure in Fig. 11. To estimate the upper bound, we have calculated the critical temperature T_c to homogeneously melt the fcc solid at constant volume. To estimate the lower bound, we have observed from above the temperature T_{ms} at which the fcc lattice loses structural stability and begins to transform to another structure at constant volume. We find that $T_{\text{ms}} \sim 0.5T_{\text{m}}^{\text{fcc}}$ consistent with our choice of $0.5T_{\text{m}}^{\text{fcc}}$ as the lower temperature limit in the MGPT-RSMD simulations to determine fcc ion-thermal free energy.

As a final step, we have added the electron-thermal contribution A_{el} to form the total fcc free energy A_{fcc} at the same level of approximation as obtained above for the bcc structure in Sec. IIIC and for the liquid in Sec. IIID:

$$A_{\text{fcc}}(\Omega, T) = E_0^{\text{fcc}}(\Omega) + A_{\text{ion}}^{\text{fcc}}(\Omega, T) + A_{\text{el}}(\Omega, T) . \quad (56)$$




Fig. 11 High-pressure melt curve for the metastable fcc structure in Ta, as calculated without electron-thermal free energy contributions ($A_{el} = 0$). Solid square points denote input melt data from two-phase MGPT-MD simulations [11], while the solid line is the calculated melt curve from the output fcc free energy and the liquid free energy. The dashed lines represent approximate upper (T_c) and lower (T_{ms}) bounds on fcc mechanical stability.

A corresponding total fcc EOS table was then assembled and the fcc free-energy melt calculation repeated. As expected, the impact of A_{el} on the fcc melt curve was found to be small, lowering the calculated melt temperature by 3% or less at all pressures, exactly as was the case for the bcc melt curve (Fig. 9a).

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In the present paper we have elaborated and implemented an efficient computational method based on reversible scaling molecular dynamics [3] to calculate accurate Helmholtz free energies of weak-coupling materials characterized by temperature-independent ion forces and additive cold, ion-thermal and electron-thermal free-energy components. With our method such materials can be treated in stable solid phases, in the liquid, and in metastable phases alike over wide ranges of volume and temperature, with both significant cost savings and controllable numerical accuracy achieved in the central ion-thermal RSMD simulations. In stable solid phases, our approach smoothly combines a standard quasiharmonic-phonon calculation of the ion-thermal free energy at low temperatures with an RSMD simulation of the anharmonic vibrational free-energy component at high temperatures to produce a seamless ion-thermal free energy from $T = 0$ to above melt at each volume of interest. In the liquid, we first use variational perturbation theory [4,7,23,24] to optimize an appropriate r^{-12} reference pair potential and then perform a smooth thermodynamic integration to the true system to establish a reference free energy along a high-temperature isotherm at the top of temperature range of interest. At each volume, a single RSMD simulation is then used to obtain an ion-thermal free energy for the liquid from the reference temperature down to below melt. In metastable solid phases, a reference free energy is established along the solidus melt line by using melt input from independent two-phase MD simulations combined with the calculated liquid free energy. For each volume, an RSMD simulation to higher temperature and an RSMD simulation to lower temperature is used to calculate the ion-thermal free energy within the limits of mechanical stability of the metastable phase.

We have specifically adapted our free-energy method to metals where the ion forces are well described by multi-ion MGPT interatomic potentials [6-11], together with the inclusion of small additional electron-thermal contributions to the free energy. Using refined Ta6.8x MGPT potentials in the QHLD, VPT and RSMD calculations, we have successfully applied this method to the stable-bcc, liquid, and metastable-fcc phases of tantalum. For each phase, we have calculated a total Helmholtz free energy and its components to sub-mRy numerical accuracy over an extended volume range from up to

26% expansion to nearly two-fold compression and temperatures up to 25,000 K. The small anharmonic vibrational free-energy component in the bcc solid, which is only 1-5 mRy in magnitude near melt in Ta, has been everywhere converged to 0.1 mRy. The physical accuracy of the total free energy obtained for each phase has been tested through the calculation of sensitive thermodynamic properties of Ta, including the specific heat and thermal expansion coefficient in the bcc solid and the liquid at ambient pressure, the bcc and metastable-fcc melting curves to high pressure above 400 GPa, and the equation of state and shock Hugoniot in the bcc and liquid phases, extending to pressures of 600 GPa.

We conclude that the present RSMD-based free-energy method is an attractive approach for calculating accurate multiphase equations of state and equilibrium phase lines, as well as for investigating metastable phases and possible polymorphism [11], in weak-coupling materials, provided reliable temperature-independent ion forces are available. In addition to multi-ion MGPT potentials, the present free-energy method can be adapted to other temperature-independent potentials, including GPT [12-16], BOP [17-19], EAM [21], and FS [22] potentials among others, for suitable applications in relevant materials. It may also be possible to extend this method to DFT quantum simulations like QMD in weak-coupling materials, provided the electrons are held at zero temperature and not allowed to equilibrate with the ions, as is normally the case in current QMD simulations on metals [5,20]. A major challenge there, however, would be the severe limitations on time step and simulation duration imposed by QMD.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contract No. DE-AC52-07NA27344. J.B.H. acknowledges support as a summer student at LLNL in 2011 from DOE SciDAC Grant No. DE-FC02-06ER25788, during which time some of this work was begun.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Frenkel and B. Smit, *Understanding Molecular Simulation* (Academic Press, San Diego, 1996).
- [2] M. E. Tuckerman, *Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Molecular Simulation* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2010).
- [3] M. de Koning, A. Antonelli, and S. Yip, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3973 (1999) and references therein.
- [4] N. W. Ashcroft and D. Stroud, in *Solid State Physics*, edited by F. Seitz, D. Turnbull, and H. Ehrenreich (Academic Press, New York, 1978), Vol. 33, p. 1 and references therein.
- [5] D. Alfè, M. J. Gillan, and G. D. Price, J. Chem. Phys. **116**, 6170 (2002).
- [6] J. A. Moriarty, Phys. Rev. B **42**, 1609 (1990).
- [7] J. A. Moriarty, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 12431 (1994).
- [8] J. A. Moriarty, J. F. Belak, R. E. Rudd, P. Söderlind, F. H. Streitz, and L. H. Yang, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **14**, 2825 (2002).
- [9] J. A. Moriarty, L. X. Benedict, J. N. Glosli, R. Q. Hood, D. A. Orlikowski, M. V. Patel, P. Söderlind, F. H. Streitz, M. Tang, and L. H. Yang, J. Mater. Res. **21**, 563 (2006).
- [10] J. A. Moriarty, J. N. Glosli, R. Q. Hood, J. E. Klepeis, D. A. Orlikowski, P. Söderlind, and L. H. Yang, in *TMS 2008 Annual Meeting Supplemental Proceedings Volume I: Materials Processing and Properties* (TMS, Warrendale, PA, 2008), p. 313.
- [11] J. B. Haskins, J. A. Moriarty, and R. Q. Hood, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 224104 (2012).
- [12] J. A. Moriarty and A. K. McMahan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 809 (1982); A. K. McMahan and J. A. Moriarty, Phys. Rev. B **27**, 3235 (1983).
- [13] J. A. Moriarty, Phys. Lett. A **131**, 41 (1988).
- [14] J. D. Althoff, P. B. Allen, R. M. Wentzcovitch, and J. A. Moriarty, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 13253 (1993); J. A. Moriarty and J. D. Althoff, Phys. Rev. B **51**, 5609 (1995); C. W. Greeff and J. A. Moriarty, Phys. Rev. B **59**, 3427 (1999).
- [15] J. A. Moriarty, High Pres. Res. **13**, 343 (1995).
- [16] J. A. Moriarty and M. Widom, Phys. Rev. B **56**, 7905 (1997).

- [17] D. G. Pettifor, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 2480 (1989).
- [18] D. G. Pettifor, *Bonding and Structure of Molecules and Solids* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1995).
- [19] M. W. Finnis, *Interatomic Forces in Condensed Matter* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003), pp. 242-252.
- [20] J. A. Moriarty, R. Q. Hood, and L. H. Yang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 036401 (2012).
- [21] M. S. Daw, S. M. Foiles, and M. I. Baskes, Mater. Sci. Rep. **9**, 251 (1993).
- [22] M. W. Finnis and J. E. Sinclair, Philos. Mag. A **50**, 45 (1984).
- [23] D. A. Young and F. J. Rogers, J. Chem. Phys. **81**, 2789 (1984).
- [24] D. B. Boercker and D. A. Young, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 6379 (1989).
- [25] J. R. Morris, C. Z. Wang, K. M. Ho, and C. T. Chan, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 3109 (1994).
- [26] J. A. Moriarty Phys. Rev. B **38**, 3199 (1988).
- [27] L. H. Yang, P. Söderlind, and J. A. Moriarty, Philos. Mag. A **81**, 1355 (2001).
- [28] P. Vinet, J. H. Rose, J. Ferrante, and J. R. Smith, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **1**, 1941 (1989) and references therein.
- [29] W. G. Hoover, A. J. C. Ladd, and B. Moran, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 1818 (1982); D. J. Evans, J. Chem. Phys. **78**, 3297 (1983).
- [30] M. P. Allen and D. J. Tildesley, *Computer Simulation of Liquids* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1989).
- [31] W. G. Hoover, *Computational Statistical Mechanics* (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1991).
- [32] P. Söderlind and J. A. Moriarty Phys. Rev. B **57**, 10340 (1998).
- [33] L. Burakovsky, S. P. Chen, D. L. Preston, A. B. Belonoshko, A. Rosengren, A. S. Mikhaylushkin, S. I. Simak, and J. A. Moriarty, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 255702 (2010).
- [34] A. D. B. Woods, Phys. Rev. **136**, A781 (1964).
- [35] K. W. Katahara, M. H. Manghnani, and E. S. Fisher, J. Phys. F: Metal Phys. **9**, 773 (1979).
- [36] R. Hultgren, P. D. Desai, D. T. Hawkins, M. Gleiser, K. K. Kelley, and D. D. Wagman, *Selected Values of the Thermodynamical Properties of the Elements* (American Society for Metals, Metals Park, Ohio, 1973), pp. 490-495.

- [37] J. W. Shaner, G. R. Gathers, and C. Minichino, *High Temp. High Pressures* **9**, 331 (1977).
- [38] G. R. Gathers, *International J. Thermophysics* **4**, 149 (1983). This paper corrects pyrometry calibration errors on the liquid temperatures reported in Ref. [37].
- [39] A. Berthault, L. Arles, and J. Matricon, *International J. Thermophysics* **7**, 167 (1986).
- [40] Y. S. Touloukian, R. K. Kirby, R. E. Taylor, and P. D. Desai, *Thermophysical Properties of Matter (Thermal Expansion – Metallic Elements and Alloys)*, Vol. 12 (Plenum, NewYork, 1975).
- [41] A. Strachan, T. Cagin, O. Gülseren, S. Mukherjee, R. E. Cohen, and W. A. Goddard III, *Modeling Simul. Mater. Sci. Eng.* **12**, S445 (2004).
- [42] A. Dewaele, M. Mezouar, N. Guignot, and P. Loubeyre, *Phys. Rev Lett.* **104**, 255701 (2010).
- [43] J. M. Brown and J. W. Shaner, in *Shock Waves in Condensed Matter – 1983*, edited by J. R. Asay, R. A. Graham, and G. K. Straub, (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1984), pp. 91-94.
- [44] C. Dai, J. Hu, and H. Tan, *J. Appl. Phys.* **106**, 043519 (2009).
- [45] H. Cynn and C.-S. Yoo, *Phys. Rev. B* **59**, 8526 (1999).
- [46] A. Dewaele, P. Loubeyre, and M. Mezouar, *Phys. Rev. B* **70**, 094112 (2004).
- [47] A. C. Mitchell and W. J. Nellis, *J. Appl. Phys.* **52**, 3363 (1981).
- [48] N. C. Holmes, J. A. Moriarty, G. R. Gathers, and W. J. Nellis, *J. Appl. Phys.* **66**, 2962 (1989).